

TO THE PUBLIC.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
DAILY APPEAL, ONE YEAR, \$10.00
DAILY APPEAL, SIX MONTHS, \$6.00
DAILY APPEAL, THREE MONTHS, \$3.50
DAILY APPEAL, ONE MONTH, \$1.00
SUNDAY APPEAL, ONE YEAR, \$2.00
SUNDAY APPEAL, SIX MONTHS, \$1.25
SUNDAY APPEAL, THREE MONTHS, .75
SUNDAY APPEAL, ONE MONTH, .25
DAILY APPEAL, IN ADVANCE.
DAILY APPEAL, DELIVERED BY CARRIER,
SUNDAY PAPERS BY MAIL.

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

Transient advertisements, first insertion, 25 cents per line; subsequent insertions, 15 cents per line. Advertisements for one month, 50 cents per line; for three months, \$1.25 per line; for six months, \$2.25 per line; for one year, \$4.00 per line. All advertisements must be paid for in advance. Advertisements for one month, 50 cents per line; for three months, \$1.25 per line; for six months, \$2.25 per line; for one year, \$4.00 per line. All advertisements must be paid for in advance.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Correspondence, or Public Events, solicited from every part of the United States.

MEMPHIS APPEAL.

F. A. TYLER, - - - EDITOR.

FRIDAY MORNING, : : : DEC. 10, 1869.

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

W. H. STEPHENS, of Shelby.

J. B. HEISKELL, of Shelby.

H. B. BATE, of Tipton.

All debts incurred by individual owners or employees must be settled by the party contracting, as none will be paid at our counter or recognized as an offset to any account due this office.

KEATING, ENGLISH & CO.

A few days ago Mr. FLEMING, the member from Knox, introduced a bill to regulate the publication of legal notices, a matter about which the public have not very liberal or explicit at present. The bill was called up on the 5th inst., upon opposition by Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, who suspects the bill was "got up for the benefit of printers," it was, on motion of Mr. CALDWELL, referred to the Judiciary Committee, whence, we hope, either by the members from Shelby will call it up, give to the House the existing good reasons for its passage, and push it through without delay. There is not a State in the Union where newspaper publishers are so poorly regulated for legal advertising as in Tennessee. The law regulating printers' fees has stood for years at existing rates. The price of paper, of ink, of composition and press-work during that time, has more than doubled; rents, clerk hire, and all the expenses entering into the production of a newspaper have advanced in like proportion, and yet Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, dignifiedly opposes a bill to relieve us to some extent—a bill that will enable us to about get our money back and no more, with the ready words "got up for the benefit of printers." Well, it is "got up for the benefit of printers," and why Mr. STEPHENS should not be "got up for the benefit of printers?" Is it because they work and toil in the public service, that they should have no benefit? Is it because they do all sorts of labor for the people, both and are ever vigilant and faithful, that they are not entitled to benefit? Or is it that they helped to elect the present Legislature, to turn the scales of Radicalism, have really rescued the State from utter and entire ruin, that they are to be denied the benefits of a bill, every word of which is based upon right, upon justice and equity? Perhaps Mr. STEPHENS would like for publishers to continue (as they have for half a century in Tennessee) to "take out" two-thirds of their legal advertising "in charging it on the books." We demur to this. We, in common with our brethren of the press, have had about enough of it, and we propose, in all sincerity, if the bill of Mr. FLEMING be passed, that the publishers of the State meet in convention and agree upon a scale of prices for legal advertising that will pay them well and leave a fair margin of profit; and further, that they shall bind themselves to adhere to it strictly. Moreover, we urge the representatives from Shelby to give the bill careful consideration and a candid support if they can, as we think they can, in conscience do so.

In Mississippi, the more Radical candidate prevailed over his Republican competitor. In such a contest, well defined, our sympathies would range with the more conservative. But the canvass in Mississippi was singular and complicated that we cannot thus define our sympathies. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican.

Now, a quite general consent has obtained that such a law is based on wrong principles, and should not be enacted. Under these circumstances it was not anticipated that, pending the decision of the constitutional and moral question involved, the principle of taxing a selected class of property-holders for the common benefit of the community would be re-nected. And if it was, we had at least reason to expect opposition would be carefully avoided, and that the tax would be made equal as between individuals of the class of men whom the Legislature had selected for its victims. But we were disappointed. Some body in Memphis has fixed up a charter, and put it through the Legislature in the interest of the contractors and speculators, and against the rights of the community at large. The justice of selecting one class for exclusive taxation for improvements, inuring to the common benefit of all the people, should be apparent to any but the most muddy-headed and stupid of legislators. But, as if incapable of perceiving this, a patent principle, the Legislature, by this charter, not only violates equality in selecting its class of citizens to be taxed, but goes still further, and is careful to make the charter operate unequally as possible between the victims themselves. The right of state by the front foot, without reference to value, and also exempting property in the rear, almost or quite equally benefited by a pavement, operates to throw three-fourths of the cost of the improvement on the front, and to place the greater portion of that three-fourths on those owning vacant property, and who are least able to bear it! What legislative wisdom! What a magnificent display of public benefaction! Of course, it is expected the people will say amen—well done, good and faithful servants—you have been faithful in adopting the bill sent to you, without a question of its fairness and justice, and now you shall be made rulers of all the cities of Tennessee on the same principle. The classes of men exempted from taxation are the most numerous, and will certainly ap-

prove, and make a few pay all the taxes, and select from that few those most obnoxious on account of their wealth and ownership of real estate—provided their sense of justice is not shocked by such a proceeding, and they do not refuse to be benefited themselves by oppression of their friends and neighbors. We are glad to say that our citizens generally will not approve or lend themselves to such iniquity. We will do the Legislature the justice to suppose that part of the city charter passed without careful inspection on the presumption that it was in accordance with the wishes of our citizens. If so, it is not too late to repeal it. If, however, have intended to enforce the oppression, we trust they will at least do the justice to punish their selected victims on the principle of the Constitution, and by an equal valuation of their property, to be exclusively taxed, and not so unequally as to compel those who have least income from their property to bear the larger portion of the tax for the benefit of those who have the most, as well as for that of all the rest of the world. This is the most shameful piece of legislation which has ever disgraced the statute books of a Republican government. The fault was thrown out before to property holders, that if they wanted to avoid paying the tax they should "sell their property to somebody else who would pay it." But it turns out in many instances that lots in Memphis have so depreciated in value that their owners cannot even do that.

Purchasers cannot be found for property where its possession is taxed as a privilege, and its whole value as an investment taken away. So capital flies the limits of Tennessee through unequal taxation of its owners, and men are learning to regard a State wherein the enterprise of merchants is discouraged, and capital cannot be so invested in real or other estate as to yield the income which it readily yields in other States.

WASHINGTON correspondents state that a number of Tennessee Radicals are in that city for the purpose of petitioning Congress to interfere with the present Legislature of Tennessee, and prevent them from repealing the laws secured to the citizens of the State by the civil rights bill, which they claim the Legislature is endeavoring to do. Resolutions of inquiry are already prepared for presentation to Congress. So STOKES' threat to reduce the State again under military jurisdiction is not abandoned. It is the last expiring Radical struggle for supremacy. And the thing is too dead in Tennessee to admit anything more than the possibility of the death throes.

Failures of Mails.

A subscriber of ours, a resident of Lafayette Depot, writes us on the 7th inst., that he and others of our friends are in the part of the State, do not get the APPEAL regularly. He says:

"Several friends and subscribers of the APPEAL, have for years past advocated the position the paper has so nobly sustained, through the many trying ordeals through which it has passed. We as subscribers have large interest in the paper, and we must not think hard at this complaint. Nearly four weeks since we nearly corrected. The latest issue received by us, a late hour of the day yesterday, included the return from Ohio, Mississippi Central, Vicksburg and Meridian, Mobile and Ohio, New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern, and the Mississippi and Tennessee Railroads, the writer of this article met with a large number of 'non-commercial tourists,' otherwise called 'drifters,' from the cities of St. Louis, Louisville and New York, and with them only one from the city of Memphis. Most of these 'commercial tourists,' and especially those from Louisville and St. Louis, were full of malice, and were determined to do mischief to the paper, and to remedy these grievances."

Complaints similar to the above reach us from the Big Creek and other neighborhoods. Will Postmaster DELONG be kind enough to look into and to remedy these grievances?"

Memphis Losing Trade.

Editors Appeal: On a recent trip over the line of the Memphis and Ohio, Mississippi Central, Vicksburg and Meridian, Mobile and Ohio, New Orleans, Jackson and Great Northern, and the Mississippi and Tennessee Railroads, the writer of this article met with a large number of 'non-commercial tourists,' otherwise called 'drifters,' from the cities of St. Louis, Louisville and New York, and with them only one from the city of Memphis. Most of these 'commercial tourists,' and especially those from Louisville and St. Louis, were full of malice, and were determined to do mischief to the paper, and to remedy these grievances."

Now, a quite general consent has obtained that such a law is based on wrong principles, and should not be enacted. Under these circumstances it was not anticipated that, pending the decision of the constitutional and moral question involved, the principle of taxing a selected class of property-holders for the common benefit of the community would be re-nected. And if it was, we had at least reason to expect opposition would be carefully avoided, and that the tax would be made equal as between individuals of the class of men whom the Legislature had selected for its victims. But we were disappointed. Some body in Memphis has fixed up a charter, and put it through the Legislature in the interest of the contractors and speculators, and against the rights of the community at large. The justice of selecting one class for exclusive taxation for improvements, inuring to the common benefit of all the people, should be apparent to any but the most muddy-headed and stupid of legislators. But, as if incapable of perceiving this, a patent principle, the Legislature, by this charter, not only violates equality in selecting its class of citizens to be taxed, but goes still further, and is careful to make the charter operate unequally as possible between the victims themselves. The right of state by the front foot, without reference to value, and also exempting property in the rear, almost or quite equally benefited by a pavement, operates to throw three-fourths of the cost of the improvement on the front, and to place the greater portion of that three-fourths on those owning vacant property, and who are least able to bear it! What legislative wisdom! What a magnificent display of public benefaction! Of course, it is expected the people will say amen—well done, good and faithful servants—you have been faithful in adopting the bill sent to you, without a question of its fairness and justice, and now you shall be made rulers of all the cities of Tennessee on the same principle. The classes of men exempted from taxation are the most numerous, and will certainly ap-

THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1869.

F. A. TYLER, - - - EDITOR.

FRIDAY MORNING, : : : DEC. 10, 1869.

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

W. H. STEPHENS, of Shelby.

J. B. HEISKELL, of Shelby.

H. B. BATE, of Tipton.

All debts incurred by individual owners or employees must be settled by the party contracting, as none will be paid at our counter or recognized as an offset to any account due this office.

KEATING, ENGLISH & CO.

A few days ago Mr. FLEMING, the member from Knox, introduced a bill to regulate the publication of legal notices, a matter about which the public have not very liberal or explicit at present. The bill was called up on the 5th inst., upon opposition by Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, who suspects the bill was "got up for the benefit of printers," it was, on motion of Mr. CALDWELL, referred to the Judiciary Committee, whence, we hope, either by the members from Shelby will call it up, give to the House the existing good reasons for its passage, and push it through without delay. There is not a State in the Union where newspaper publishers are so poorly regulated for legal advertising as in Tennessee. The law regulating printers' fees has stood for years at existing rates. The price of paper, of ink, of composition and press-work during that time, has more than doubled; rents, clerk hire, and all the expenses entering into the production of a newspaper have advanced in like proportion, and yet Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, dignifiedly opposes a bill to relieve us to some extent—a bill that will enable us to about get our money back and no more, with the ready words "got up for the benefit of printers." Well, it is "got up for the benefit of printers," and why Mr. STEPHENS should not be "got up for the benefit of printers?" Is it because they work and toil in the public service, that they should have no benefit? Is it because they do all sorts of labor for the people, both and are ever vigilant and faithful, that they are not entitled to benefit? Or is it that they helped to elect the present Legislature, to turn the scales of Radicalism, have really rescued the State from utter and entire ruin, that they are to be denied the benefits of a bill, every word of which is based upon right, upon justice and equity? Perhaps Mr. STEPHENS would like for publishers to continue (as they have for half a century in Tennessee) to "take out" two-thirds of their legal advertising "in charging it on the books." We demur to this. We, in common with our brethren of the press, have had about enough of it, and we propose, in all sincerity, if the bill of Mr. FLEMING be passed, that the publishers of the State meet in convention and agree upon a scale of prices for legal advertising that will pay them well and leave a fair margin of profit; and further, that they shall bind themselves to adhere to it strictly. Moreover, we urge the representatives from Shelby to give the bill careful consideration and a candid support if they can, as we think they can, in conscience do so.

In Mississippi, the more Radical candidate prevailed over his Republican competitor. In such a contest, well defined, our sympathies would range with the more conservative. But the canvass in Mississippi was singular and complicated that we cannot thus define our sympathies. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican.

Now, a quite general consent has obtained that such a law is based on wrong principles, and should not be enacted. Under these circumstances it was not anticipated that, pending the decision of the constitutional and moral question involved, the principle of taxing a selected class of property-holders for the common benefit of the community would be re-nected. And if it was, we had at least reason to expect opposition would be carefully avoided, and that the tax would be made equal as between individuals of the class of men whom the Legislature had selected for its victims. But we were disappointed. Some body in Memphis has fixed up a charter, and put it through the Legislature in the interest of the contractors and speculators, and against the rights of the community at large. The justice of selecting one class for exclusive taxation for improvements, inuring to the common benefit of all the people, should be apparent to any but the most muddy-headed and stupid of legislators. But, as if incapable of perceiving this, a patent principle, the Legislature, by this charter, not only violates equality in selecting its class of citizens to be taxed, but goes still further, and is careful to make the charter operate unequally as possible between the victims themselves. The right of state by the front foot, without reference to value, and also exempting property in the rear, almost or quite equally benefited by a pavement, operates to throw three-fourths of the cost of the improvement on the front, and to place the greater portion of that three-fourths on those owning vacant property, and who are least able to bear it! What legislative wisdom! What a magnificent display of public benefaction! Of course, it is expected the people will say amen—well done, good and faithful servants—you have been faithful in adopting the bill sent to you, without a question of its fairness and justice, and now you shall be made rulers of all the cities of Tennessee on the same principle. The classes of men exempted from taxation are the most numerous, and will certainly ap-

THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1869.

F. A. TYLER, - - - EDITOR.

FRIDAY MORNING, : : : DEC. 10, 1869.

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

W. H. STEPHENS, of Shelby.

J. B. HEISKELL, of Shelby.

H. B. BATE, of Tipton.

All debts incurred by individual owners or employees must be settled by the party contracting, as none will be paid at our counter or recognized as an offset to any account due this office.

KEATING, ENGLISH & CO.

A few days ago Mr. FLEMING, the member from Knox, introduced a bill to regulate the publication of legal notices, a matter about which the public have not very liberal or explicit at present. The bill was called up on the 5th inst., upon opposition by Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, who suspects the bill was "got up for the benefit of printers," it was, on motion of Mr. CALDWELL, referred to the Judiciary Committee, whence, we hope, either by the members from Shelby will call it up, give to the House the existing good reasons for its passage, and push it through without delay. There is not a State in the Union where newspaper publishers are so poorly regulated for legal advertising as in Tennessee. The law regulating printers' fees has stood for years at existing rates. The price of paper, of ink, of composition and press-work during that time, has more than doubled; rents, clerk hire, and all the expenses entering into the production of a newspaper have advanced in like proportion, and yet Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, dignifiedly opposes a bill to relieve us to some extent—a bill that will enable us to about get our money back and no more, with the ready words "got up for the benefit of printers." Well, it is "got up for the benefit of printers," and why Mr. STEPHENS should not be "got up for the benefit of printers?" Is it because they work and toil in the public service, that they should have no benefit? Is it because they do all sorts of labor for the people, both and are ever vigilant and faithful, that they are not entitled to benefit? Or is it that they helped to elect the present Legislature, to turn the scales of Radicalism, have really rescued the State from utter and entire ruin, that they are to be denied the benefits of a bill, every word of which is based upon right, upon justice and equity? Perhaps Mr. STEPHENS would like for publishers to continue (as they have for half a century in Tennessee) to "take out" two-thirds of their legal advertising "in charging it on the books." We demur to this. We, in common with our brethren of the press, have had about enough of it, and we propose, in all sincerity, if the bill of Mr. FLEMING be passed, that the publishers of the State meet in convention and agree upon a scale of prices for legal advertising that will pay them well and leave a fair margin of profit; and further, that they shall bind themselves to adhere to it strictly. Moreover, we urge the representatives from Shelby to give the bill careful consideration and a candid support if they can, as we think they can, in conscience do so.

In Mississippi, the more Radical candidate prevailed over his Republican competitor. In such a contest, well defined, our sympathies would range with the more conservative. But the canvass in Mississippi was singular and complicated that we cannot thus define our sympathies. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican.

Now, a quite general consent has obtained that such a law is based on wrong principles, and should not be enacted. Under these circumstances it was not anticipated that, pending the decision of the constitutional and moral question involved, the principle of taxing a selected class of property-holders for the common benefit of the community would be re-nected. And if it was, we had at least reason to expect opposition would be carefully avoided, and that the tax would be made equal as between individuals of the class of men whom the Legislature had selected for its victims. But we were disappointed. Some body in Memphis has fixed up a charter, and put it through the Legislature in the interest of the contractors and speculators, and against the rights of the community at large. The justice of selecting one class for exclusive taxation for improvements, inuring to the common benefit of all the people, should be apparent to any but the most muddy-headed and stupid of legislators. But, as if incapable of perceiving this, a patent principle, the Legislature, by this charter, not only violates equality in selecting its class of citizens to be taxed, but goes still further, and is careful to make the charter operate unequally as possible between the victims themselves. The right of state by the front foot, without reference to value, and also exempting property in the rear, almost or quite equally benefited by a pavement, operates to throw three-fourths of the cost of the improvement on the front, and to place the greater portion of that three-fourths on those owning vacant property, and who are least able to bear it! What legislative wisdom! What a magnificent display of public benefaction! Of course, it is expected the people will say amen—well done, good and faithful servants—you have been faithful in adopting the bill sent to you, without a question of its fairness and justice, and now you shall be made rulers of all the cities of Tennessee on the same principle. The classes of men exempted from taxation are the most numerous, and will certainly ap-

THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1869.

F. A. TYLER, - - - EDITOR.

FRIDAY MORNING, : : : DEC. 10, 1869.

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

W. H. STEPHENS, of Shelby.

J. B. HEISKELL, of Shelby.

H. B. BATE, of Tipton.

All debts incurred by individual owners or employees must be settled by the party contracting, as none will be paid at our counter or recognized as an offset to any account due this office.

KEATING, ENGLISH & CO.

A few days ago Mr. FLEMING, the member from Knox, introduced a bill to regulate the publication of legal notices, a matter about which the public have not very liberal or explicit at present. The bill was called up on the 5th inst., upon opposition by Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, who suspects the bill was "got up for the benefit of printers," it was, on motion of Mr. CALDWELL, referred to the Judiciary Committee, whence, we hope, either by the members from Shelby will call it up, give to the House the existing good reasons for its passage, and push it through without delay. There is not a State in the Union where newspaper publishers are so poorly regulated for legal advertising as in Tennessee. The law regulating printers' fees has stood for years at existing rates. The price of paper, of ink, of composition and press-work during that time, has more than doubled; rents, clerk hire, and all the expenses entering into the production of a newspaper have advanced in like proportion, and yet Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, dignifiedly opposes a bill to relieve us to some extent—a bill that will enable us to about get our money back and no more, with the ready words "got up for the benefit of printers." Well, it is "got up for the benefit of printers," and why Mr. STEPHENS should not be "got up for the benefit of printers?" Is it because they work and toil in the public service, that they should have no benefit? Is it because they do all sorts of labor for the people, both and are ever vigilant and faithful, that they are not entitled to benefit? Or is it that they helped to elect the present Legislature, to turn the scales of Radicalism, have really rescued the State from utter and entire ruin, that they are to be denied the benefits of a bill, every word of which is based upon right, upon justice and equity? Perhaps Mr. STEPHENS would like for publishers to continue (as they have for half a century in Tennessee) to "take out" two-thirds of their legal advertising "in charging it on the books." We demur to this. We, in common with our brethren of the press, have had about enough of it, and we propose, in all sincerity, if the bill of Mr. FLEMING be passed, that the publishers of the State meet in convention and agree upon a scale of prices for legal advertising that will pay them well and leave a fair margin of profit; and further, that they shall bind themselves to adhere to it strictly. Moreover, we urge the representatives from Shelby to give the bill careful consideration and a candid support if they can, as we think they can, in conscience do so.

In Mississippi, the more Radical candidate prevailed over his Republican competitor. In such a contest, well defined, our sympathies would range with the more conservative. But the canvass in Mississippi was singular and complicated that we cannot thus define our sympathies. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican.

Now, a quite general consent has obtained that such a law is based on wrong principles, and should not be enacted. Under these circumstances it was not anticipated that, pending the decision of the constitutional and moral question involved, the principle of taxing a selected class of property-holders for the common benefit of the community would be re-nected. And if it was, we had at least reason to expect opposition would be carefully avoided, and that the tax would be made equal as between individuals of the class of men whom the Legislature had selected for its victims. But we were disappointed. Some body in Memphis has fixed up a charter, and put it through the Legislature in the interest of the contractors and speculators, and against the rights of the community at large. The justice of selecting one class for exclusive taxation for improvements, inuring to the common benefit of all the people, should be apparent to any but the most muddy-headed and stupid of legislators. But, as if incapable of perceiving this, a patent principle, the Legislature, by this charter, not only violates equality in selecting its class of citizens to be taxed, but goes still further, and is careful to make the charter operate unequally as possible between the victims themselves. The right of state by the front foot, without reference to value, and also exempting property in the rear, almost or quite equally benefited by a pavement, operates to throw three-fourths of the cost of the improvement on the front, and to place the greater portion of that three-fourths on those owning vacant property, and who are least able to bear it! What legislative wisdom! What a magnificent display of public benefaction! Of course, it is expected the people will say amen—well done, good and faithful servants—you have been faithful in adopting the bill sent to you, without a question of its fairness and justice, and now you shall be made rulers of all the cities of Tennessee on the same principle. The classes of men exempted from taxation are the most numerous, and will certainly ap-

THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1869.

F. A. TYLER, - - - EDITOR.

FRIDAY MORNING, : : : DEC. 10, 1869.

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

W. H. STEPHENS, of Shelby.

J. B. HEISKELL, of Shelby.

H. B. BATE, of Tipton.

All debts incurred by individual owners or employees must be settled by the party contracting, as none will be paid at our counter or recognized as an offset to any account due this office.

KEATING, ENGLISH & CO.

A few days ago Mr. FLEMING, the member from Knox, introduced a bill to regulate the publication of legal notices, a matter about which the public have not very liberal or explicit at present. The bill was called up on the 5th inst., upon opposition by Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, who suspects the bill was "got up for the benefit of printers," it was, on motion of Mr. CALDWELL, referred to the Judiciary Committee, whence, we hope, either by the members from Shelby will call it up, give to the House the existing good reasons for its passage, and push it through without delay. There is not a State in the Union where newspaper publishers are so poorly regulated for legal advertising as in Tennessee. The law regulating printers' fees has stood for years at existing rates. The price of paper, of ink, of composition and press-work during that time, has more than doubled; rents, clerk hire, and all the expenses entering into the production of a newspaper have advanced in like proportion, and yet Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, dignifiedly opposes a bill to relieve us to some extent—a bill that will enable us to about get our money back and no more, with the ready words "got up for the benefit of printers." Well, it is "got up for the benefit of printers," and why Mr. STEPHENS should not be "got up for the benefit of printers?" Is it because they work and toil in the public service, that they should have no benefit? Is it because they do all sorts of labor for the people, both and are ever vigilant and faithful, that they are not entitled to benefit? Or is it that they helped to elect the present Legislature, to turn the scales of Radicalism, have really rescued the State from utter and entire ruin, that they are to be denied the benefits of a bill, every word of which is based upon right, upon justice and equity? Perhaps Mr. STEPHENS would like for publishers to continue (as they have for half a century in Tennessee) to "take out" two-thirds of their legal advertising "in charging it on the books." We demur to this. We, in common with our brethren of the press, have had about enough of it, and we propose, in all sincerity, if the bill of Mr. FLEMING be passed, that the publishers of the State meet in convention and agree upon a scale of prices for legal advertising that will pay them well and leave a fair margin of profit; and further, that they shall bind themselves to adhere to it strictly. Moreover, we urge the representatives from Shelby to give the bill careful consideration and a candid support if they can, as we think they can, in conscience do so.

In Mississippi, the more Radical candidate prevailed over his Republican competitor. In such a contest, well defined, our sympathies would range with the more conservative. But the canvass in Mississippi was singular and complicated that we cannot thus define our sympathies. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican.

Now, a quite general consent has obtained that such a law is based on wrong principles, and should not be enacted. Under these circumstances it was not anticipated that, pending the decision of the constitutional and moral question involved, the principle of taxing a selected class of property-holders for the common benefit of the community would be re-nected. And if it was, we had at least reason to expect opposition would be carefully avoided, and that the tax would be made equal as between individuals of the class of men whom the Legislature had selected for its victims. But we were disappointed. Some body in Memphis has fixed up a charter, and put it through the Legislature in the interest of the contractors and speculators, and against the rights of the community at large. The justice of selecting one class for exclusive taxation for improvements, inuring to the common benefit of all the people, should be apparent to any but the most muddy-headed and stupid of legislators. But, as if incapable of perceiving this, a patent principle, the Legislature, by this charter, not only violates equality in selecting its class of citizens to be taxed, but goes still further, and is careful to make the charter operate unequally as possible between the victims themselves. The right of state by the front foot, without reference to value, and also exempting property in the rear, almost or quite equally benefited by a pavement, operates to throw three-fourths of the cost of the improvement on the front, and to place the greater portion of that three-fourths on those owning vacant property, and who are least able to bear it! What legislative wisdom! What a magnificent display of public benefaction! Of course, it is expected the people will say amen—well done, good and faithful servants—you have been faithful in adopting the bill sent to you, without a question of its fairness and justice, and now you shall be made rulers of all the cities of Tennessee on the same principle. The classes of men exempted from taxation are the most numerous, and will certainly ap-

THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1869.

F. A. TYLER, - - - EDITOR.

FRIDAY MORNING, : : : DEC. 10, 1869.

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

W. H. STEPHENS, of Shelby.

J. B. HEISKELL, of Shelby.

H. B. BATE, of Tipton.

All debts incurred by individual owners or employees must be settled by the party contracting, as none will be paid at our counter or recognized as an offset to any account due this office.

KEATING, ENGLISH & CO.

A few days ago Mr. FLEMING, the member from Knox, introduced a bill to regulate the publication of legal notices, a matter about which the public have not very liberal or explicit at present. The bill was called up on the 5th inst., upon opposition by Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, who suspects the bill was "got up for the benefit of printers," it was, on motion of Mr. CALDWELL, referred to the Judiciary Committee, whence, we hope, either by the members from Shelby will call it up, give to the House the existing good reasons for its passage, and push it through without delay. There is not a State in the Union where newspaper publishers are so poorly regulated for legal advertising as in Tennessee. The law regulating printers' fees has stood for years at existing rates. The price of paper, of ink, of composition and press-work during that time, has more than doubled; rents, clerk hire, and all the expenses entering into the production of a newspaper have advanced in like proportion, and yet Mr. STEPHENS, of Marshall, dignifiedly opposes a bill to relieve us to some extent—a bill that will enable us to about get our money back and no more, with the ready words "got up for the benefit of printers." Well, it is "got up for the benefit of printers," and why Mr. STEPHENS should not be "got up for the benefit of printers?" Is it because they work and toil in the public service, that they should have no benefit? Is it because they do all sorts of labor for the people, both and are ever vigilant and faithful, that they are not entitled to benefit? Or is it that they helped to elect the present Legislature, to turn the scales of Radicalism, have really rescued the State from utter and entire ruin, that they are to be denied the benefits of a bill, every word of which is based upon right, upon justice and equity? Perhaps Mr. STEPHENS would like for publishers to continue (as they have for half a century in Tennessee) to "take out" two-thirds of their legal advertising "in charging it on the books." We demur to this. We, in common with our brethren of the press, have had about enough of it, and we propose, in all sincerity, if the bill of Mr. FLEMING be passed, that the publishers of the State meet in convention and agree upon a scale of prices for legal advertising that will pay them well and leave a fair margin of profit; and further, that they shall bind themselves to adhere to it strictly. Moreover, we urge the representatives from Shelby to give the bill careful consideration and a candid support if they can, as we think they can, in conscience do so.

In Mississippi, the more Radical candidate prevailed over his Republican competitor. In such a contest, well defined, our sympathies would range with the more conservative. But the canvass in Mississippi was singular and complicated that we cannot thus define our sympathies. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican. The Western man who saw her husband fight the bear, "and did not even get a scratch," was a Republican.

Now, a quite general consent has obtained that such a law is based on wrong principles, and should not be enacted. Under these circumstances it was not anticipated that, pending the decision of the constitutional and moral question involved, the principle of taxing a selected class of property-holders for the common benefit of the community would be re-nected. And if it was, we had at least reason to expect opposition would be carefully avoided, and that the tax would be made equal as between individuals of the class of men whom the Legislature had selected for its victims. But we were disappointed. Some body in Memphis has fixed up a charter, and put it through the Legislature in the interest of the contractors and speculators, and against the rights of the community at large. The justice of selecting one class for exclusive taxation for improvements, inuring to the common benefit of all the people, should be apparent to any but the most muddy-headed and stupid of legislators. But, as if incapable of perceiving this, a patent principle, the Legislature, by this charter, not only violates equality in selecting its class of citizens to be taxed, but goes still further, and is careful to make the charter operate unequally as possible between the victims themselves. The right of state by the front foot, without reference to value, and also exempting property in the rear, almost or quite equally benefited by a pavement, operates to throw three-fourths of the cost of the improvement on the front, and to place the greater portion of that three-fourths on those owning vacant property, and who are least able to bear it! What legislative wisdom! What a magnificent display of public benefaction! Of course, it is expected the people will say amen—well done, good and faithful servants—you have been faithful in adopting the bill sent to you, without a question of its fairness and justice, and now you shall be made rulers of all the cities of Tennessee on the same principle. The classes of men exempted from taxation are the most numerous, and will certainly ap-

THE MEMPHIS DAILY APPEAL. FRIDAY, DECEMBER 10, 1869.

F. A. TYLER, - - - EDITOR.

FRIDAY MORNING, : : : DEC. 10, 1869.

DEMOCRATIC TICKET.

FOR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION.

W. H. STEPHENS, of Shelby.